

1969

Volume 01 (Part 3)

Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/ohioevans>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), and the [Criminal Procedure Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas, "Volume 01 (Part 3)" (1969). *Ohio v. Fred Ahmed Evans: Trial record transcript, 1969*. 39.

<https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/ohioevans/39>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections and Archives at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ohio v. Fred Ahmed Evans: Trial record transcript, 1969 by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

Q Now, then, I understood from what we could see of this exhibit, showing you what has been identified as State's Exhibit 10-B, let's see if I can hold it so the jury can see it.

MR. FLEMING: Come down here.

MR. TOLLIVER: Come down here.

THE COURT: Mr. Tolliver, it is just about time for our afternoon break. We can put this out in front of the jury after the recess.

MR. TOLLIVER: There is no objection to that, Judge.

THE COURT: We will take our recess.

Folks, for the information of everybody, just a minute, please, for the information of everybody, Court will be held tomorrow. It will be held all day, so we will recess at this time.

When you are outside of the court room, don't talk to anybody and don't let anybody talk to you about this matter.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

- - -

THE COURT:

Mr. Laurie?

MR. CORRIGAN:

He is on some other business. We may go forward.

THE COURT:

All right.

Proceed.

MR. TOLLIVER:

Shall we continue?

THE COURT:

Jim said somebody walked out. I didn't quite understand who he said walked out. Proceed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (continued)

BY MR. TOLLIVER:

Q Doctor, showing you what has been identified as State's Exhibit 10, along the mouth, I guess this is what you would call the entrance of the wound?

A Well, the margin of the wound.

Q The bullet came this way?

THE COURT:

Mr. Tolliver,

is it your intention to have the jury see that you are pointing out to the Doctor?

MR. TOLLIVER:

Yes. Otherwise, it is just a private conversation.

THE COURT:

It is a little bit of a wall between the picture and the jury, too.

MR. TOLLIVER:

All right, Judge.

(Witness left the stand and went to the jury box.)

Q Now, this is the entrance of the wound here (indicating)?

A This is the margin of the wound. I interpret the wound as indicating the bullet passed on this side.

Q In this direction (indicating)?

A Yes.

Q Where is this "abundant powder residue"?

A It's not on your surface. It's underneath -- I can see it under the microscope.

Q This is where the bullet struck?

A The bullet went in and wiped itself off.

Q I see. And you say, "abundant powder residue," that means more than a normal amount?

A Well, it means it's more than a little.

"Abundant" means a fair amount.

Q I see.

A Not huge, you know, more than a little.

Q Now, can you give us any idea, since you say there is an abundant powder residue, how close the muzzle was of the gun that fired this shot?

A No, I think that we are dealing again with the distant gunshot wound, that whatever powder is found here in abundant quantity was brought into the wound by the

bullet; in other words, riding on the bullet and the bullet wiped itself off, because I don't see any powder on the skin, which was the fouling and stippling that I described before the recess.

Q I understand.

A So I interpret this as indicating that the dirty bullet going through Mr. Chapman's head wiped itself off and then left his body.

Q When you say "dirty bullet," you mean with powder?

A Yes, because the gun that fired that bullet had been fired several times. The barrel was fouled. The bullet would wipe off some of that smoke and carried it with it as it sped off.

Q You can't give us any idea what distance that was fired?

A As we discussed before, that this particular gun, I don't know which it was, deposited smoke at a maximum distance we'll say of 24 inches, then this would be 25 inches, 250 inches, or 2500. I can't be more specific, any more specific than that.

Q I see. You really can't give us an estimate, because you don't know?

A That's right. "You'd have to fire the gun with the same ammunition at test targets under controlled conditions

if one is to come up with a scientific, valid answer.

MR. TOLLIVER: You may resume
the stand.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

(Witness resumed the stand.)

Q Now, it was my understanding, Doctor, that there
were some X-rays taken, is that correct, sir?

A About whom are we referring?

Q James Chapman.

A Yes, we X-rayed Mr. Chapman's head.

Q And were there some fragments found?

A In the X-ray, the radiologist -- X-ray specialist --
reported fragments of bullets going through. I have his
report here.

Would you like to see it?

Q Yes.

(Document handed to counsel.)

A When the bullet passes through tissue, little
pieces of bullet -- this is signed by Dr. Gene Kaufman,
X-ray specialist and on the staff of Lakeside Hospital.

He said: "The A. P., Anterior Posterior view of
the skull" -- that means shooting X-rays front to back --
"shows extensive fractures of the calvaria," that means
the rest of the skull was broken.

Multiple small (millimeters), which means they are

less than 1/25 of an inch in size, many densities representing fragments of bullets. He can't say one or more.

Conclusion: Fracture of calvaria with bullet fragments.

Q Well, now, Doctor, is there such an examination or test called the Neutron Activation Analysis?

A I believe that is some type of chemical analytic test, physical chemical test.

Q What would be the purpose of that test?

A I don't know too much about it. It's really a test that is done by chemists and physicists. I've never done it or had it done. I'm not sufficiently familiar with it to discuss it really intelligently.

Q Well then, could you tell us whether or not this test was conducted on the fragments found in the brain of James Chapman?

A There was no test done of fragments. In fact, I recovered no fragments. The fragments are dust size, really. They are so tiny you couldn't recover them. As I felt through the brain and examined it, I couldn't see anything that I could grasp and recover comparable at all to what I found in Mr. Wolff.

These are tiny things, almost like flour, little tiny things, pinpoint size.

Q This particular test that neutron activation analysis wasn't made?

A Correct.

Q All right. Now, Doctor, to be more specific, I was asking you about the effect that it would have on persons with .20 or .25 in the blood and I want to ask you specifically, in your opinion, could a police officer with that much alcohol in his blood function properly as a police officer?

A I don't believe he --

MR. CORRIGAN: Objection.

THE WITNESS: Excuse me.

THE COURT: There is a lot of

functioning as far as police officers are concerned.

MR. TOLLIVER: Let me be more specific.

THE COURT: I sustain the objection.

Q Well, put it this way: You know that there was a riot going on.

MR. CORRIGAN: Objection.

THE COURT: Finish your question.

MR. CORRIGAN: The doctor doesn't know anything.

MR. TOLLIVER: You mean that literally?

THE WITNESS: I am speechless.

THE COURT: The Court will take exception to that remark. We will order it stricken.

Q Doctor --

A Yes.

Q -- under a riot condition, where there are persons firing weapons and police, in order to maintain law and order are firing back, could a police officer with .20 or .25 alcohol in the blood be of assistance and operate properly under those conditions?

A What you are really asking are two different questions. He might be of assistance but I don't think he is

at a hundred per cent efficiency for any reasonable purpose. No human being is, police officer or otherwise, with that amount of alcohol, but he is not paralyzed.

Q All right. Well, let me ask you this, Doctor. You are the Chief Assistant to the Coroner, Dr. Gerber?

A I am the Chief Deputy Coroner.

Q The Chief Deputy Coroner?

A Correct.

Q Therefore, Dr. Hoffman would be your assistant, is that correct?

A He is my colleague.

Q Well, but you are the Chief Assistant --

A I suppose so. I have to accept that responsibility.

Q -- Deputy?

A Correct.

Q All right. And my specific question is, having been a Deputy Coroner for how many years?

A I am in my 19th busy year.

Q Since 1950?

A Correct.

Q All right. And you are well aware of the functions and the duties of police officers?

A Oh, generally as a citizen and as a Deputy Coroner, certainly.

Q Because you come in contact with them as a Coroner?

A Daily, many times each day.

Q So my specific question would be that if a police officer had .20 or .25 alcohol in his blood, from what experience you have had with police officers, would he be able to function normally?

A Far from 100 per cent efficiency under any circumstances. No human being functions normally, whatever his responsibilities are, with that amount of alcohol in his blood. He is under the influence.

Q He wouldn't be able to carry out normal duties under those circumstances?

A Not a hundred per cent, far from it.

MR. TOLLIVER: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: Any further questions?

MR. LAURIE: No further questions of this witness.

THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor.

MR. TOLLIVER: Just a moment.

BY MR. TOLLIVER:

Q One thing, I'd just like to have it marked for identification, the protocol and the laboratory analysis.

A On which one?

Q On both of them.

A Certainly. Do you have Xerox copying --

MR. TOLLIVER: I imagine the Court can make them available.

THE WITNESS: If you like, I will have them brought in. You want to have it marked as an exhibit? I will Xerox it and bring it back.

MR. TOLLIVER: We just want the small report of the autopsy.

THE WITNESS: Do you want the laboratory data?

MR. TOLLIVER: And the laboratory data on each of these.

(Defendant's Exhibits G, H, I, and J were marked for the purpose of identification.)

MR. TOLLIVER: We would ask that these be submitted into evidence, Judge.

MR. CORRIGAN: No objection.

MR. TOLLIVER: With the proviso that photostats can be substituted for the originals.

THE COURT: They may be admitted.

(Defendant's Exhibits G through J were received in evidence.)

Q (By Mr. Tolliver) One last question, Doctor.

A Yes, Mr. Tolliver.

Q Did there come a time that some time in February when Mr. Laurie came out to talk to Dr. Hoffman?

A Yes, in February he came to talk to Dr. Hoffman and to me and to some other members of our staff. That is correct.

Q You were present at the time of that conversation?

A Yes, I was, certainly.

Q And was this a time prior to February?

A I don't remember any specific kind of conference. We may have spoken informally, but in February he went out to the Coroner's office. We came to our amphitheater, projected the pictures and discussed the cases in some detail.

Q At the particular time --

A Yes, sir.

Q -- who else was present at the particular time?

A I think Sergeant Joyce was there, a member of the Cleveland Police Department; Mr. Laurie, Dr. Hoffman and I and Miss Purdon was there. She is a member of our staff. And I believe Miss Cowan may have been there, our senior medical technologist. I am not sure, but I think four or five of us were there.

Q At this particular conference, the matter that is now at hand was discussed?

A Yes. The pictures were projected. The wounds -- the findings ventilated and discussed between all of us.

Q After this discussion was had, do you know whether or not there was any changes made in the protocol of Mr. Jones?

A Yes, I do.

Q Were the changes made?

A Yes. I am familiar with the changes.

Q And did they come about as a result of this discussion?

A Yes. When the pictures were projected and photographs examined and the protocol was read, it was our conclusion that this wound on the left side of the neck that we looked at before was not made by a shotgun; was, rather, made by a high-velocity missile, and that was the major change and the basis of our review of all of the material.

Q And, of course, the original autopsy on Lieutenant Jones was not made by you?

A No. That is Dr. Hoffman's. He is one of the five examined by Dr. Hoffman that day.

MR. CORRIGAN:

Just one question,

your Honor.

MR. TOLLIVER:

Wait a minute.

Q (By Mr. Tolliver) From your recollection, Doctor, were there any other police officers there, other than Sergeant Joyce?

A I only remember Sergeant Joyce at that time.

Q When you speak of --

A Yes. He's been in here and he has been very helpful and courteous. I believe he was the only police officer at that conference, as I recall.

MR. TOLLIVER:

Thank you, Doctor.

THE WITNESS:

Thank you, sir.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CORRIGAN:

Q With regard to the correcting of the protocol, did you prevail upon Dr. Hoffman to make the change or make the correction?

A I don't know what you mean.

We discussed it and we reached the conclusion that he made an original interpretation of shotgun was really high-velocity gunshot wound. In the interest of being correct, he amended that he now considered it a high-velocity gunshot wound.

Nobody forced him to do it. He wanted to come up

with the correct answer.

Q Do you know whether or not Mr. Laurie had prevailed upon him to change it?

A Mr. Laurie is a fine prosecutor, but he is not a pathologist.

MR. LAURIE:

Thank you, Doctor.

MR. CORRIGAN:

No further

questions.

THE COURT:

Thank you, Doctor.

(Witness excused.)

MR. LAURIE:

The State will

call Patricia Purdon.

THEREUPON, the State of Ohio, further to maintain the issues on its part to be maintained, called as a witness PATRICIA PURDON, who, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LAURIE:

Q May I have your name for the record, ma'am.

A Patricia Louise Purdon.

Q Spell your last name.

A P-u-r-d-o-n.

Q What is your business or occupation?

A I am police science technician in the Trace Evidence Department of the Coroner's office.

Q How long have you been so employed?

A A little over five years.

Q Prior to being employed by the Coroner's office, did you obtain some formal education for your position?

A I did.

Q Will you tell us where that was and what degrees, if any, did you receive?

A I received my degree from Michigan State University. The degree is in police science, a bachelor of science

degree in police science.

Q After graduation you came to the Coroner's office to work?

A Yes, sir.

Q And then what department did you work in there?

A The Trace Evidence Laboratory.

Q Worked under whom?

A Miss Mary Cowan.

Q Who is Miss Mary Cowan?

A Well, she is the chief of the Trace Evidence Laboratory, who has been in that capacity for over twenty years.

Q Can you describe to the jury the type of work that you are doing?

A Well, the work of the Trace Evidence Laboratory involves many things, from the examination of biological specimens received from autopsies to the examination of clothing and other evidence submitted by the police relative to Coroner's cases and suburban police cases.

Q Have you testified in any Coroner's case or criminal matters?

A Yes, sir.

Q How many have you testified --

A About twelve or thirteen times, sir.

Q Was this in this county, in the Common Pleas Court?

A Not always in this court, no, sir.

Q But courts in this county?

A Yes, sir.

Q And directing your attention, Miss Purdon, to a date of on or about July the 24th, 1968, did you have an occasion to do some laboratory work on some clothing, for example a one Mr. Golonka?

A Yes, sir.

Q And when and where was this?

A On July 24th, at the Coroner's office.

(State's Exhibit No.
11 was marked for
identification.)

Q Handing you what has been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 11, can you identify this exhibit, please, and tell us, yes or no, first?

A Yes.

Q You will have to speak loud so we can hear you.

A Yes, sir.

Q What is it?

A This is the clothing which belonged to Louis Golonka.

Q Will you detail, as best you can, what you did with this particular exhibit, and explain to the jury what if any findings you have made with relation thereto?

A My duty was to examine this clothing and note the significant defects in it.

THE COURT: Significant what?

THE WITNESS: Defects.

MR. LAURIE: Maybe if I stand

here, you can speak a little louder. Go ahead.

A (Continuing) So, I -- well, for example, on the gray police officer's shirt, I noted that there were multiple small defects, and also that there were metal fragments.

Q When you say "multiple small defects," can you explain to the jury what you mean by that?

A Well, there is a pattern of holes in the garment, most of which are about 1/16 of an inch in diameter; the appearance of which suggested to me that it is a shotgun pattern, and this is supported by the fact that there were metal pellets recovered in this position (indicating).

Q You are pointing on the lip of the left front pocket, is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you have a piece of transparent paper over a portion of the area, is that what you are pointing to?

A Yes. To secure it in position.

Q There is underneath this a small pellet?

A Yes.

Q This pattern you referred to on the shirt, is it from the front?

A Yes, sir, mostly across the upper front portion.

Q All right. As opposed to the back,

Then, did you do anything with the rest of the exhibit, pertaining to Officer Golonka?

A Yes. Each of the items was examined. On the shirt there is a similar pattern (indicating), and also another pellet which was held in the fabric.

Q Shotgun pellet?

A I believe so, yes, sir.

Q You have that tagged under transparent paper on the shirt?

A Yes.

Q Then --

A Then, I also examined the trousers and the -- there is a pattern also, crossed the front and left side of the trousers (indicating).

Q Pattern of what, Miss Rondon?

A Multiple small defects, again consistent with a shotgun pattern.

Q All right. That is right down the front bottom portion of the waist, is that what you are referring to?

A Yes. None of these go below the knee.

Q All right. And anything further from what is remaining?

A There are two similar defects in the shorts the man was wearing. The other items are not significant.

Q Similar defect, again shotgun pattern?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, Miss Purdon, when you made your observation of this shotgun pattern, as you testified, on the shirt, undershirt, pants, did you make any more tests for anything else, for example, or examinations?

A Yes, we normally compare these defects with the pathologist's report on the wounds in the body.

Q How did they correspond in the wounds of the body of Officer Golonka?

A The pattern is similar on the body of the victim.

Q Did you find any fouling or powder markings on the areas of this pattern?

A No, sir, I ran a chemical test for the presence of nitrites of gun powder. I did not find any.

Q This meaning what?

A That there was a considerable distance between the weapon and the victim.

(State's Exhibit No. 12 was marked for the purpose of identification.)

Q Miss Purdon, handing you what has been marked for

identification purposes as State's Exhibit 12, can you identify this exhibit, yes or no first?

A Yes, sir.

Q What is it?

A This is the clothing of William Wolff.

Q When did you examine, if you indeed did examine this exhibit?

A I examined this on the 24th of July also.

Q All right. And tell us what, if anything, did you do during your examination of this particular exhibit?

A Again the examination was to note any significant defects, particularly those which would correspond to any wounds in the body.

Q What were your findings, if any?

A That there are some defects in the clothing. None of them do correspond to those in the body.

Q When you say, "defects," these are defects of what type?

A On the back of the shirt, in addition to the cutting defects, which were on this item when it was received, there is this tear here (indicating), and two gaping defects down here.

Q What about this tear on the side (indicating)?

A These are cuts and tear defects which appeared to be done with something like a scissors.

Q I see. And what, if any patterns or missile holes did you find with regard to this exhibit?

A The only two that I suspected to be missile defects were here (indicating).

Q Indicating the bottom and back of the shirt?

A Right. There is a grazed-type defect in the waistline of the trousers also, but as I say, these do not correspond to any injury to the body.

MR. TOLLIVER: Could you do that again? I didn't see what she was pointing to.

MR. LAURIE: The bottom of the shirt, see it?

THE WITNESS: (Indicating).

Q Did you find any powder or stippling marks on this?

A No, sir, I did not.

Q This is the extent of your examination on State's Exhibit 12, the alleged garments of Mr. Wolff?

A All of the garments were examined, but there was nothing of significance on the others.

(State's Exhibit No. 13 was marked for identification purposes.)

Q Handing you what has been marked for the purpose of identification as State's Exhibit 13, Miss Purdon, can you identify this exhibit?

A Yes, sir.

Q What is it?

A This is the clothing of LeRoy Jones.

Q Did you examine these clothings on the same day as you did the others?

A Yes, sir.

Q What, if anything, were your findings on this particular exhibit?

A Well, this particular exhibit has a number of significant defects in it. Those which are not of importance are the number of cut defects. Those are not consistent with any of the injures on the body.

The ones which are of importance (indicating),
going --

Q Keep your voice up loud.

A Yes, sir. The first that I noticed was an in-and-out defect of the pockets, but this does not go through the garment, does not touch the body (indicating).

Q You are referring to the right pocket of the shirt?

A Yes, sir.

Q All right.

A Then, down on the right side --

Q Of the shirt?

A Of the shirt, there is a defect which appears to be an exit defect. There is an entrance and exit defect here of the -- excuse me. There is a defect and

a tear defect on the right sleeve (indicating). On the left side, there is another defect here (indicating).

Q Referring to the left side of the shirt?

A Yes.

Q Under the arm area of the shirt?

A Yes, and there is a defect which has a bar small black rim, what I call a wipe off rim.

Q All right.

A Which is consistent with an entrance gunshot defect.

Q All right.

A Then on the back of this garment, there is, first of all, this great tearing defect here (indicating), and this is consistent with an injury to the body. There is --

Q Now, you refer here, that is near the shoulder area?

A Yes, sir.

Q It is a grazing defect, you say?

A Yes.

Q All right. Then down here on the -- again, where on the shirt?

A The left back, upper left back just below the arm-hole area ; is an entrance-type defect, again having the black wipe off rim and the defect is consistent with an exit defect and these are consistent with the pathologist's report.

Q You compared the two?

A Yes, sir.

Q Other than the shirt, have you made any examination of the remaining portions of Lieutenant Jones' clothing?

A Yes, sir. These were examined for, again, defects and they are corresponding defects in those items in the T-shirt.

Q In the T-shirt to the shirt to the body, that is what you are saying?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that it?

A Yes.

(State's Exhibit
No. 14 was marked
for identification.)

Q Handing you, Miss Purdon, what is identified as State's Exhibit 14, can you identify this exhibit?

A Yes, sir.

Q And what is it?

A This is the clothing of James Chapman.

Q Did you examine this clothing?

A Yes, sir.

Q And have you discovered, if anything, with this particular exhibit?

A Well, this particular item -- I will take the coat. The right back shoulder of the coat exhibits a ragged defect (indicating), and in probing further we found on the inside the path of a missile of some type, and recovered from this area two copper metal fragments.

Q Now, what area is that where you recovered the metal fragments?

A The metal fragments are just below -- they would be on the back of the right arm, shoulder area.

(State's Exhibit
No. 15 was marked
for identification.)

THE COURT: Is there a question
of some kind for the witness? You marked an exhibit.

MR. LAURIE: I am waiting.
They haven't given it back to me, Judge.

(Object handed to counsel.)

THE COURT: You have it now.

MR. LAURIE: I have it just this
moment.

Q (By Mr. Laurie) Miss Purdon, handing you what has
been marked as State's Exhibit 15, can you identify this
exhibit?

A The envelope bears my signature and my handwriting.

Q What is it?

A These are the metal fragments which I removed from
the right shoulder area of the coat.

Q Did you put it in that little container?

A I did.

Q Did you put it in that envelope?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that your handwriting on that envelope?

A Yes, sir.

Q What did you do with that after you found it and put
it in the envelope?

A This was turned over to our property custodian, Mr. Blocher, who then turned this over to S. I. U., as all such particles and pellets are done.

Q This is the pellet that you removed from this coat?

A Yes, sir.

Q Miss Purdon, did there come a time during your examination of these clothings, you were given a weapon to examine?

A Yes, sir.

(State's Exhibit
No. 16 was marked
for identification.)

MR. FLEMING: May we approach
the bench, your Honor?

(Thereupon a discussion was had between the Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury, and off the record.)

Q Miss Purdon, handing you what has been marked as State's Exhibit 16, can you identify this exhibit?

THE COURT: I assume all these
weapons have been checked?

MR. LAURIE: Checked and re-
checked, Judge, believe me.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

Q Have you seen that weapon before?

A (Witness nods.)

Q Your answer is "yes"?

A Yes.

Q What if anything did you do with that weapon, and where?

MR. FLEMING: Objection unless it is connected to the defendant.

MR. LAURIE: It is going to be connected.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: The question really is, did she do something with it.

MR. LAURIE: And if so, where.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A Well, I examined this gun at the Coroner's office, and I examined it for the presence of bloodstains.

Q Did you make that examination and that test then?

A I did.

Q What were the results of that test, if any?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Well, were there some significant findings?

THE WITNESS: There were, sir.

THE COURT: Well, come up here.

(Thereupon a discussion was had between the

Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury, and off the record.)

Q Will you give the result of your findings?

A I found that there were two areas of bloodstains on the weapon and that there was sufficient material to run tests for the blood group, and the result being that they could be either Group AB or Group B.

Q Group AB or B?

A Yes.

Q And the part of the gun in which you used to make this blood grouping is from where on the gun?

A (Indicating) On the upper portion of this wooden grip, there was a stain which was of sufficient size to group.

Q I am pointing at the pump part of the gun (indicating).

A Yes.

Q You took a portion of stain from this portion to make this group testing?

A Yes, sir.

Q It was either AB or B?

A Yes, sir.

MR. FLEMING:

Objection.

THE COURT:

Overruled.

MR. LAURIE:

That is all of

this witness at this time, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATIONBY MR. FLEMING:

Q Miss Purdon -- is that the correct pronunciation?

A Purdon, yes.

Q Miss Purdon, now, with regard to Lieutenant LeRoy Jones, I believe you indicated that on the front of his shirt you saw a defect that was consistent with an exit wound, is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q I am showing you what has been marked for identification purposes as State's Exhibit 13.

MR. FLEMING: May we have the witness step down?

THE COURT: Certainly.

(Witness left the stand and went to the jury box.)

Q Would you show the jury where that exit wound was?

A If the garment was held in the normal position -- I will need your assistance with this,

Q Okay. Fine.

A (Indicating) On the right side, near the right side seam is an exit defect.

THE COURT: I didn't hear you,

Miss Purdon.

THE WITNESS:

On the right front,

at the right side, near the seam, is an exit defect.

Q (By Mr. Fleming) Now, will you show the jury where the entrance defect is consistent with that wound on this shirt?

A That I am not sure of. I made note of the entrances and exits of the pathologist, but as far as the path of the bullet I cannot tell you that.

Q Is there a defect on this shirt consistent with an entrance wound at the back?

A There is an entrance on the back. Yes, sir, it is right here (indicating), on the upper left back, again near the side seam, there is an entrance defect.

Q Now, you determined that this was an entrance wound or an entrance defect, on the 24th of July, when you made your examination; is that right?

A Yes, sir.

Q I believe also on this shirt was a grazing wound, on the back of the shirt?

A Yes, sir, there is.

Q Will you show that to the jury?

A (Witness indicates.)

Q Now, from your examination, could you ascertain what kind of instrument or weapon caused this grazing defect?

A The only thing that was indicated is that the metal

streak on the fabric, before this disruption of fabric, the appearance is a metal-like glistening, it suggests the presence of lead of the gun, but so far as any other test for the presence of gunpowder residue, nothing could be determined here.

There are consistent defects with the shirt and T-shirt and the body in this area (indicating).

Q All right. Now, on Wolff. You said that you observed a pattern in the back on this, referring to State's Exhibit 12?

A Now, on the back there is a tear in the garment which is not consistent with anything. This is not present in the shirt beneath it.

The other defects on this item were the gaping defects here on the bottom (indicating).

Q Is that consistent with anything, any wound on the body?

A No, there is no wound on the body to correspond with it.

Q All right. Were there any defects on the front of this one?

A No, sir.

Q All right. Then, with Chapman, I believe you indicated that you recovered these fragments and that there was a pattern in the coat reflecting the path of that

fragment. That would be State's Exhibit 14.

Now, can you show us where the entrance --

A Right. If I put my finger through (indicating), the entrance is above the area where the lining of the shoulder pads go, extending through, and it was from this area that we recovered the metal fragments.

Q Recovered it from the coat?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, referring to State's Exhibit 10-C, now, the defect in this coat is consistent with the markings depicted in this photograph?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, was this fragment ever sent -- you may resume the stand.

(Witness resumed the stand.)

Q Was the fragment that you recovered from this coat ever sent to the Scientific Investigation Unit?

A Yes, sir.

Q And it was then returned to your office?

A No, sir.

Q Okay. Now, with regard to these entrance wounds on the back of Lieutenant Jones' shirt, you say that they are reflected in the protocol?

A Yes, sir. There is one entrance wound, I believe, described in the protocol.

Q Will you show me where that is, please.

A You have a circular entrance type gunshot wound over the left lateral chest at the mid-axillary line, in number 3.

Q Where?

A One on the left side -- now, this may refer to the one in the front (indicating).

THE COURT: Pardon me. The question was would you point out to Mr. Fleming where that is shown in the protocol. That is really all. If he wants you to read it, he can read it.

A The number of defects correspond. I am --

Q Referring to Defendant's Exhibit C, which is the autopsy report of Lieutenant Jones, can you tell us where the entrance wound was indicated?

A No, sir, I cannot. There are wounds in the locations but what are described as entrances and exits differ from my examination of the clothing.

Q And they differ from your examination of the clothing.

A And what is described as an entrance is described here as an exit.

Q So, in other words, where you reveal the entrance wound, as you indicated on the actual shirt there, was an entrance wound, the person was shot in the back, that it would be Lieutenant Jones was shot in the back, is that correct?

A There is one at the left back side.

Q Yes. And as it is reflected in the protocol, it

would reflect that Lieutenant Jones was shot from the front, is that correct?

A He does exhibit one gunshot of the front.

Q But the protocol reflects two from the front and none from the back, is that correct?

A This one is described as right lateral.

Q You will have to keep your voice up.

A One of the entrance wounds is described as right lateral which means to the side. The other is described as left lateral.

Q I see.

A So to say definitely front or back -- and even on the clothing, you see that the entrances are toward the side, not a direct mid-back hit or mid-front.

Q I see. But anyway, with regard to your records, you refer to it as a back wound because in your opinion it was in the back, is that correct?

A I refer to it as back because it is on the back of the garment.

Q I see.

A It is behind the side seams.

Q But that wound -- did you see the body?

A I have seen the photographs of the body.

Q And did you see a wound on the body consistent with the defect in the shirt?

A There is a wound in the location.

Q I beg your pardon?

A There is a wound in the location described.

Q All right. Now, when you make these reports, do you get together at some point with the pathologist to ascertain whether or not your findings are consistent with each other?

A In some instances, yes, sir.

Q On this occasion with regard to Lieutenant LeRoy Jones, did you have a conference with the pathologist to determine whether or not your findings and his findings were consistent with each other?

A We did, sir, but some time at a later date, not at the time the cases were being examined initially.

Q Did you find at that time that there were some inconsistencies in the report that you have made as compared to the report that he had made?

A Yes, sir.

Q So that when we talked about inconsistencies, you did, in fact, find a pertinent inconsistency with regard to your findings and with regard to the entrance and exit wounds on Lieutenant LeRoy Jones, is that correct?

A We did not agree, that is right, sir.

Q Will you tell us in what area it was that the two of you did not agree?

A In which wounds were described as entrances and

which described as exits.

Q And did you alter your findings with regard to what was an exit wound and what was an entrance wound?

A No, sir.

Q Do you know of your own knowledge as to whether or not he altered his decision?

A No, sir.

Q So in other words, then you have one opinion about it, in what manner the bullet entered Lieutenant Jones and he has another, isn't that the fact?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, at any time since you made your original report with regard to your evaluations of the trace evidence that you observed, have you made any changes in your report?

A No, sir.

MR. FLEMING: Nothing further.

You may inquire.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. LAURIE: Thank you, Miss

Purdon.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Come up, counsel.

(Thereupon a discussion was had between the Court and counsel, outside the hearing of the jury, and off the record.)

THE COURT:

Ladies and gentlemen,

there are a few matters that the Court must go over with counsel and so what I will do is I will ask the bailiff to take you upstairs and you remain there for a short time.

Now, you are not going to come back down, but we are not quite ready to have you leave yet. So you will remain up there.

Now, once again what we talked about before, when you are outside of the court room, don't talk to anybody or permit anybody to talk to you about this case.

Don't formulate or express any opinions. Don't even talk to each other about it.

I know that there are some arrangements that have to be made for your comfort later this afternoon. I am sure that the people in charge will properly accommodate you.

So with that, as far as the jury is concerned, they will be excused. The matters that we have to take up with counsel will then be taken up, but you remain upstairs until Jim makes arrangements for you. Thank you very much.

(Thereupon the following proceedings were had in the absence of the jury:)

THE COURT: You can be seated.
Here, if any of you gentlemen want to go, you may go. We have a few matters we want to take up here.

If it is of interest to you to remain, but if you want to leave at this time, you may leave. Otherwise, you will leave whenever we are concluded.

MR. LAURIE: Your Honor, at this time the State would like to offer into evidence State's Exhibit 2. That was the small shotgun pellet originally identified by the doctor taken from victim Golonka.

MR. TOLLIVER: We object.

THE COURT: The shotgun pellet is 2. Is there an objection?

MR. FLEMING: Yes, we object.

THE COURT: Exhibit 2 will be admitted.

(State's Exhibit 2 was received in evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: Then, I believe the next early number would be 3-A, B, C and D.

THE COURT: If they are not in, they are now admitted. Because you have used them.

(State's Exhibit 3-A through 3-D were received in evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: We offer State's Exhibits 4-A, 4-D, 4-E and 4-F.

THE COURT: They have been admitted.

MR. LAURIE: 5-A and B. They have been admitted.

MR. FLEMING: I would like to be heard on the one that isn't marked and hasn't been positively identified. We object because our concern being that the actual pellet that was removed from his neck be placed in evidence.

We have no objection to a pellet being positively identified as the pellet coming from his neck being offered and coming into the evidence, but until such time as that is done, we object.

THE COURT: 5-A and 5-B are in evidence except we did provide -- you said you would like to reserve some further cross-examination of this witness. I made the observation, not actually for the reason that I was not going to admit it, but if there was some further checking, you will be permitted.

MR. FLEMING: Will you withhold ruling on B? I believe B is the one that is not positively identified, until such time -- for a while.

THE COURT: It is admitted as of now. I am perfectly satisfied if there is something further you can show me with reference to it, I will reconsider the matter. The reason I am saying this, you reserve it for something, if somebody has something specific to do, I have no problem with reference to it. I will be glad to have anybody do anything I think is proper with it, but if we just leave it up in the air, at some stage we will be right back here and nothing will be done. I am satisfied that there is enough in here to admit it in evidence.

I am so ordering it. If you want to do something with it, I will allow you.

MR. LAURIE: The next item is State's Exhibit 6 and 7, being receipts that Dr. Wecht received evidence from the Coroner.

THE COURT: All right. There is no objection to that. It will be received.

(State's Exhibits 6 and 7 were received in evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: State's Exhibit 8,

your Honor, is the pellet removed from Wolff's neck.

THE COURT: This is from the evidence testified of Dr. Adelson. It is a pellet from the head of Mr. Wolff. 8 will be admitted.

(State's Exhibit 8 was received into evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: 9-A, we withdrew. 9-B, the photograph of Wolff's face that's admitted.

10-A and 10-B are slides that we withdrew, Judge.

THE COURT: 10-C and D are photos of Mr. Chapman. They have been admitted.

MR. LAURIE: State's Exhibit 11 is Golonka's uniform.

THE COURT: Is there any objection to Mr. Golonka's uniform?

MR. FLEMING: No objection.

MR. LAURIE: And 12 is Wolff's uniform.

THE COURT: 11, and 12, do you have any objection to Mr. Wolff's --

MR. FLEMING: No objection.

THE COURT: 11 and 12 are admitted.

(State's Exhibits 11 and 12 were received in evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: 13 is Jones' uniform.

THE COURT: Any objection to

Mr. Jones?

MR. FLEMING: No objection.

MR. LAURIE: 14 is Chapman's clothing.

THE COURT: Is there an objection?

MR. FLEMING: No objection.

THE COURT: They will be received.

(State's Exhibits 13 and 14 were received in evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: And 15 is the fragment found by Miss Purdon in the shoulder of Chapman's clothing.

MR. FLEMING: I would object to that.

MR. TOLLIVER: I would object to that. This pellet, obviously, did not contribute to the death.

THE COURT: Well, it is of some evidentiary value. It would not necessarily have to be one of contributing to his death.

MR. FLEMING: More important, there is no foundation been laid. It appears

that this pellet, after having been found in the clothing, was submitted to S.I.U. Could the Court withhold ruling?

THE COURT: Mr. Fleming, she brought it in. At least she identified it in Court. She said this is the one she had actually seen at that time. She did turn it over to S.I.U.

Is there any question if we go back to S.I.U. and back to her, we will still have the same testimony?

MR. FLEMING: I don't think so.
No objection.

(State's Exhibit 15 was received in evidence.)

MR. LAURIE: We will withhold 16 until we get further evidence.

THE COURT: Is there anything further?

MR. CORRIGAN: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel, come back in chambers.

(Thereupon a discussion was had between the Court and counsel in chambers and off the record.)

(Thereupon an adjournment was taken to

THE STATE OF OHIO,)
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA.)

SS:

Saturday, April 12, 1969

McMONAGLE, J.

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
(CRIMINAL BRANCH)

THE STATE OF OHIO,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
FRED AHMED EVANS,)
Defendant.)

No. 90,257

WITNESS:	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
----------	--------	-------	----------	---------

Patricia Purdon			247 257 259	251 257 258
Walter Lee Washington, Jr.	261	297		
Thomas J. Lanier	358	375		
Curtis Martin	386	432		
George H. Heckman	461			

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION, APRIL 12, 1969

9:15 A.M.

- - -

MR. LAURIE: Your Honor, I would like to proceed, a couple of more questions with Miss Purdon.

THE COURT: Proceed.

THEREUPON, PATRICIA PURDON, having been previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LAURIE:

Q Miss Purdon, yesterday just before you got off the stand, there was some testimony given in relation to the examination of the clothing you made that was on the body of Lieutenant Jones and you indicated to Mr. Fleming some of your findings and in connection with the report of Dr. Hoffman on the naked body, in regard to certain wounds on that body, you indicated in your testimony to Mr. Fleming that there existed some inconsistencies between your findings and the findings of Dr. Hoffman.

Now, could you explain further your position?

A Yes.

Q Please speak loud so we can all hear you.

A That the document which I examined here yesterday --

MR. FLEMING: I can't hear.

THE COURT: The document she examined here yesterday. Keep your voice up, Miss Purdon, please.

A Yes, sir. -- were not consistent with my description, so there is the appearance that we are inconsistent.

However, Dr. Hoffman and I, back in February with you, sir, had examined his findings and my findings and came to the conclusion that we are consistent and the report to be amended.

What I examined here did not include the corrections.

Q So, therefore, your answers were predicated on the original --

MR. FLEMING: Objection to leading.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Well, tell us then, for example, what were your answers to Mr. Fleming's questions predicated on?

A On the document which was in front of me, sir.

Q Let's show you that again, if I may.

THE COURT: Is there some document in existence that constitutes the corrections?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

Q Handing you what has --

A Yes, sir.

Q Handing you what has been marked as Defendant's Exhibit C, is this the document that you referred to that you predicated your answers upon when Mr. Fleming gave you that document yesterday?

A Yes, sir.

Q And that document contains the front sheet and a history sheet?

A Description of marks and wounds.

Q Now, handing you what has been identified as Defendant's Exhibit E-1, did Mr. Fleming give you that exhibit yesterday in connection with Defendant's Exhibit C to look at before you made your answer?

A No, sir.

Q And so now then, it would be a fair statement to recap what you said, you didn't have Defendant's Exhibit E-1 when you testified?

A No, sir.

Q Now, when you look at both of these exhibits together, what would your answer be in regard to any inconsistencies between you and Dr. Hoffman?

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A There is no inconsistencies then, sir.

Q All right. Incidentally, will you explain to the jury how you made the determination of an entrance-type --

what do you call -- defect on the shirt? Can you explain to the jury how you arrived at this conclusion?

A Well, the defects that I concluded were entrance defects are those which have a narrow black rim around them which is consistent with the wiping off of material from the bullet as it passes through the garment.

Q Did Dr. Hoffman have the benefit of your examination before the day I came up there and we all looked at everything?

A No.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A We had not examined it together before then.

MR. LAURIE: That is all.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. FLEMING:

Q Mrs. Purdon, I believe yesterday when we came to the pertinent part of your examination that we weren't referring to documents here in the evidence.

My question to you was, on these occasions did you get together with the pathologist to determine whether or not your findings were consistent with each other?

Do you recall that question?

A Yes, and I said in some instances they were true.

Q You said in this particular instance with regard to Lieutenant Jones that you did? Isn't that the fact?

A We did, yes.

Q And you told us that on that occasion when you and Dr. Hoffman compared your findings, that those findings were inconsistent? Isn't that what you testified to?

A They were inconsistent at that time.

Q And you told us that even yesterday, as you testified, that your findings were inconsistent with each other, didn't you?

A Inconsistent with the report you presented to me, sir.

Q No, -- well, isn't this substantially what the testimony was --

Mr. Fleming?

MR. FLEMING:

238.

MR. LAURIE:

Thank you.

Q "All right. Now, when you make these reports, do you get together at some point with the pathologist to ascertain whether or not your findings are consistent with each other?"

And your answer: "In some instances, yes, sir."

"Question: On this occasion with regard to Lieutenant LeRoy Jones, did you have a conference with the pathologist to determine whether or not your findings and his findings were consistent with each other?"

"Answer: We did, sir, but sometime at a later date, not at the time the cases were examined initially.

"Did you find at that time that there were some inconsistencies in the report that you had made, as compared to the report that he had made?"

"Answer: Yes, sir.

"So that when we talked about inconsistencies, you did, in fact, find a pertinent inconsistency with regard to your findings and with regard to the entrance and exit wounds on Lieutenant LeRoy Jones, is that correct?"

Your answer: "We did not agree, that is right, sir.

"Will you tell us in what area it was that the two of you did not agree?

"Answer: In which wounds were described as entrances and which described as exits.

"Question: And did you alter your findings with regard to what was an exit wound and what was an entrance wound?

"Answer: No, sir.

"Do you know of your own knowledge as to whether or not he altered his decision?

"No, sir.

"So, in other words, then you had one opinion about it, in what manner the bullet entered Lieutenant Jones and he has another, isn't that the fact?"

And your answer: "Yes, sir."

"Question: Now, at any time since you made your original report with regard to your evaluation of the trace evidence that you observed, have you made any changes in your report?

"No, sir."

Do you recall that testimony?

A I do, sir.

Q That testimony was the fact, wasn't it?

A And that testimony was predicated on the report you handed me, sir.

Q Well, there is no mention of the report in the portion --

MR. LAURIE:

Objection.

THE COURT:

Proceed.

Overruled.

A You do, sir, mention a comparison of my report and his report in your questions, and my answers are predicated upon the reports that were before me at that time.

Q (By Mr. Fleming) When you answered the question "and did you alter your findings with regard to what was an exit wound and entrance wound," you answered "yes, sir," was that correct?

A Yes, sir; I did not alter my report.

Q All right. Now, you said that your review of this report was stimulated by someone coming to your office. I believe you said, Mr. Laurie; is that correct?

A Yes,

Q When was it that Mr. Laurie came to you to see you about changing your report?

MR. LAURIE:

Objection.

A He did not --

MR. LAURIE:

Objection.

THE COURT:

Objection sus-

tained.

Q About your report --

MR. LAURIE: Recommend that
the jury be told to disregard that statement.

THE COURT: The jury under-
stands that they are to disregard questions and
all answers concerned with the answers that are
sustained.

Q (By Mr. Fleming) Mr. Laurie came to see you about
the report you had made?

A He came to discuss the cases with the staff of the
Corner's office, yes, sir.

Q Was there some discussion about changing your
report?

A Not my report, sir.

Q Was there some discussion about changing any
report?

A When all of the evidence was reexamined.

Q I beg your pardon?

THE COURT: She can answer it
in her own way. Proceed to answer.

A Dr. Hoffman felt that his initial report was in
error and that corrections would be made.

Q Now, can you tell us who was present there when
these decisions were made?

A Mr. Laurie was there. I was there. Miss Cowan,
Dr. Adelson, Dr. Hoffman, and for part of the time

Dr. Gerber.

Q And was Sergeant Joyce?

A Sergeant Joyce was also there.

Q Were any other members of the police department there?

A I don't believe so.

Q Do you recall?

A No.

Q How long did this conference take place?

A Most of one afternoon.

Q Do you know who initiated this particular conference?

A Mr. Laurie called the office.

Q I see. And did he talk to you at the time he called?

A I had conversations with him. Whether it was the initial one, I don't know.

Q Prior to the time that Mr. Laurie called in February of 1969, had you had any particular reason or occasion to review your report?

A I had not reviewed them at that time.

MR. FLEMING:

You may inquire.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATIONBY MR. LAURIE:

Q Finally, Miss Purdon, is your report today the same as it was the day I was out there and even before that?

A Yes, sir.

Q And is this report that you have now consistent with Dr. Hoffman's report today?

A Yes, sir.

MR. LAURIE: That is all.

THE COURT: Anything further?

FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATIONBY MR. FLEMING:

Q Now, it is my understanding that from the report that you made, Lieutenant Jones was shot in the back, is that correct?

A Near the left side.

Q Well, you were referring to the back of the shirt yesterday.

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you mean the back of the shirt?

A The back of the shirt near the left side seam.

Q The place at the back of the shirt where you indicated to the jury yesterday the entrance wound was, was that consistent with the wound on the body?

A There is a wound in that general vicinity, yes, sir.

MR. FLEMING: You may inquire.

MR. LAURIE: That is all, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Purdon.

(Witness excused.)

MR. LAURIE: May I have a moment,
Judge?

MR. FLEMING: Your Honor, could
we have that witness back? I have one or two
questions.

THE COURT: Call her back.
Counsel says they have another question or two.

We are calling Miss Purdon back.

MR. LAURIE: You had better get
her in a hurry.

THE COURT: The bailiff will be
very vigilant in his duties.

MR. LAURIE: I didn't see him go
out. I know he is very efficient, Judge, a very
fine young man.

- - -

THEREUPON, PATRICIA PURDON, having been
previously duly sworn, resumed the stand and
testified further as follows:

FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. FLEMING:

Q Just one or two questions, Miss Purdon. Last night after you completed your testimony, did you talk to anybody about this case?

A Yes, sir.

Q Who did you talk to?

A I talked with Mr. Corrigan and Mr. Laurie and Dr. Adelson.

Q And Dr. Adelson?

A Yes, sir.

Q Where did this conversation take place?

A With Mr. Corrigan and Mr. Laurie, here. With Dr. Adelson when I returned to the office.

Q Did you talk to anybody this morning?

A Mr. Corrigan and Mr. Laurie.

Q Where did that take place?

A Here, sir.

Q In the court room?

A In Mr. Corrigan's office.

MR. FLEMING:

You may inquire.

FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LAURIE:

Q When you were going out of the door here, Miss Purdon, did you see me right after you got off the stand?

A No, sir.

Q Did you call our attention to something --

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

Q -- last night, did you call our attention to something?

A Yes, sir, last night.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q What was that you called our attention to?

A I was concerned about the apparent inconsistencies in the report.

MR. LAURIE: All right. Thank you.

MR. FLEMING: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

MR. LAURIE: The State will call
Walter Washington.

THEREUPON, the State of Ohio, further to maintain the issues on its part to be maintained, called as a witness WALTER LEE WASHINGTON, JR., who, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LAURIE:

Q Face the jury. And will you state your full name for the record, sir?

A Walter Lee Washington, Jr.

Q You will have to keep your voice up.

A Walter Lee Washington, Jr.

THE COURT: Mr. Laurie, it would be better if you would go back there. His voice would carry out.

MR. LAURIE: I think I will stand right here so I can see if I can hear him.

Q State your name again.

A Walter Lee Washington, Jr.

Q Where do you reside?

A 9909 St. Clair.

Q And how old are you, Mr. Washington?

A 18.

Q And did you receive a subpoena from the State of Ohio

to be a witness in this case?

A Yes.

Q And directing your attention to the name of one Fred Ahmed Evans, did you come across that name before, sir?

A Yes.

Q When did you first come across this particular name?

A On the 22nd of July.

Q Of what year?

A 1968.

Q Under what facts and circumstances did you come across this person Fred Ahmed Evans?

A Through the Panther organization.

Q I can't hear you.

A Through the Panther organization.

Q You belong to the Panther organization?

A Yes.

Q Mr. Washington, tell us a little bit, something about this organization that you belong to?

A A little bit about it?

Q What is it?

A It's black.

Q Pardon?

A It's black.

Q It's black, but what is it, a social group or what?

A A social group.

Q Through this organization you met Mr. Evans, is that what you are saying?

A Yes.

Q And can you tell us how you met Mr. Evans through this organization?

A They called a meeting of the Black Panthers and nationalists.

Q I can't hear you.

A They called a meeting of the Black Panthers and Black Nationalists.

Q They called a meeting together?

A Yes, sir.

Q Who called this meeting together?

A I don't know.

Q Ahmed?

A I don't know.

Q You don't know?

A No.

Q All right. Where was this combined meeting to be at, sir?

A Over his house, over Ahmed's house.

Q Over Ahmed's house?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall where that was, sir?

A On Auburndale.

Q On Auburndale?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall the address?

A No.

Q If I would tell you 12312, would this refresh your memory?

A No.

Q In relation to Auburndale, is it near Lakeview?

A Yes.

Q Is there a tavern near this house?

A Lakeview Tavern.

Q In relation to the Lakeview Tavern, where was this house?

A Next door.

Q Next door to it. All right. And do I take it some of the members of the Black Panthers went to this meeting there?

A Yes, sir.

Q Were you included?

A Yes.

Q How many Black Panthers responded to the meeting at Ahmed Evans' house?

A About 14.

Q About 14?

A Yes.

Q Did you see other people at this house, too?

A Yes, sir.

Q What group did they belong to?

A Black Nationalists.

Q Who was the leader of that group?

A Otse Buby Eyan.

Q Is he a leader of all the Black Nationalists or this particular group?

A Just this particular group.

Q And did Mr. Evans lead a group of Black Nationalists?

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection, leading.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Tell us whether or not you know if Mr. Evans --

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

MR. LAURIE: I haven't even asked the question.

MR. FLEMING: You are leading as far as you have gone.

THE COURT: Do you want to ask it?

Q Tell me whether or not do you know whether Mr. Evans led a group of Black Nationalists?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A No one but the ones that was at his house.

Q He led that group?

MR. FLEMING:

Objection.

THE COURT:

Sustained.

Q What do you mean, "no more than the ones that was at his house"?

A Only the ones at his house, I guess.

MR. FLEMING:

Objection.

THE COURT:

Overruled.

Q What about them, sir?

A What?

Q What about the people that were at his house?

A I mean, he was the leader of all the nationalists.

Q I see. All right. Now, Mr. Washington, can you tell me, if you can, the names of your group that joined the Black Nationalists at Mr. Ahmed Evans' house?

A I can't name but a few.

Q Whatever ;you can.

A Santee.

Q Santee?

A Yes.

Q Who else?

A A boy named Squirrel.

Q A boy named Squirrel?

A Yes, and some more people I can't remember.

Q All right. You say about seventeen in all?

A Yes -- fourteen.

THE COURT:

He said "fourteen."

Q I'm sorry. Fourteen?

A Fourteen.

Q What was the purpose of this meeting, if you know?

A I didn't know then but --

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: The answer may stand. He didn't know then.

Q Did you learn the purpose of this meeting?

A Yes, sir.

Q What is it?

A To tell when the pot was going to jump off.

Q I didn't get that?

A To tell us when the pot was going to jump off.

Q Tell you when the pot was going to jump off?

A When it was going to be a revolution.

Q And about what time of the day was this that you had gone to this home of Ahmed Evans?

A It was in the morning.

Q About what time, Mr. Washington?

A About 8:00, 9:00.

Q I see. And was Mr. Fred Ahmed Evans there?

A No.

Q Did he arrive there?

A Yes.

Q How much later did he arrive there when you first went there?

A About an hour, hour and a half.

Q Before he came, could you recall some of the names of the Black Nationalists that were in this house on Auburndale?

A When he arrived?

Q Before he came, when you went there with your group, can you recall who was there?

A No.

Q How many of them -- did you tell me how many were there, about?

A About twenty-eight.

Q Of Black Nationalists?

A Yes.

Q And were they all males, or mixed - males and females?

A Males and females.

Q And, incidentally, what type of dress do the Black Panthers wear? Do they have other dress than the usual clothing that we are accustomed to?

A Black jackets, black pants.

Q Were they dressed in that way that morning?

A No.

Q How were they dressed? Regular clothing?

A Yes.

Q How about the Black Nationalists that you saw at

Ahmed Evans' home, how were they dressed, if you recall?

A Dashikis.

Q Dashikis?

A Yes.

Q Men and women?

A Garments.

Q The women wore what?

A Garment.

Q Is this a long garment?

A Yes.

Q Sometimes are these garments referred to as Afro garments?

A I don't know.

Q I see. All right. And when you first walked in this home, you did say it was in the morning?

I'm sorry, I don't remember.

A I said about 8:00 or 9:00.

Q 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock. All right.

MR. FLEMING:

A.M. or P.M.?

Q Did you say A.M., in the morning?

A Yes.

Q What did you observe there by way of the physical conditions of the rooms you were in?

What was in the room, and such as that? Can you describe to the jury what you observed?

A The rifles?

Q Well, was there any furniture in the room?

A There was an amplifier.

Q Amplifier?

A Yes. And a chair.

Q And a chair was there.

Any beds?

A Beds?

Q Sleeping beds.

A Yes, in one room.

Q One room. Was it a full bed, or can you describe what type of bed it was?

A Cot like.

Q Cot?

A Like, a cot-like bed.

Q A cot-like bed.

Was there any furniture in this suite?

A Stove and refrigerator.

Q I see, No tables?

A I can't recall any.

Q Incidentally, what type of a place was this where Ahmed Evans lived? Was this a wooden structure or brick?

A Brick.

Q More than one suite in this building?

A Yes.

Q Which suite did you go up into for this meeting?

A Upstairs, in the back.

Q Upstairs, in the back?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you go upstairs in the front, by chance?

A No.

Q All right. And when your group entered and met this other group, what was it -- withdraw that.

You said you saw some guns?

A Yes.

Q Will you describe to the jury how many guns and what type of guns did you observe?

A About six guns and shotguns and .22 rifles.

Q I see. And there were six all together or --

A About six.

Q I see. How about ammunition, did you see any ammunition?

A Yes, sir.

Q What type of ammunition? How much ammunition?

Do you recall how much ammunition you saw?

A About four boxes, and a few bandoleers of shotgun shells.

Q Bandoleers of shotgun shells, and boxes of ammunition?

A Yes.

Q Can you describe to the jury where these weapons were

physically in the house? On the floor or on the bed, where were they?

A On the floor.

Q I see. And what if anything was done with the weapons or, and/or ammunition, before Mr. Evans came in, if anything?

A What?

Q What was done with them? Anything?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

Q What if anything was done with the ammunition --

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q -- ammunition before Mr. Evans came?

MR. FLEMING: Objection to what was done when the defendant wasn't there.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q Anything done with them before Mr. Evans came?

A I don't know what you mean.

Q When you saw the weapons on the floor, did anybody touch them or handle or talk about them or anything done with them?

A Yes.

Q Before Mr. Evans came in?

A Yes.

Q What was done with them?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: You are asking now

what was done, not what conversation there was?

MR. LAURIE: Not the conversation,
no, sir.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A It was handled by, you know, just looking down the barrel to see what they could do. That was about it.

Q (By Mr. Laurie) All right. And were they handled by both the Black Panthers and the Black Nationalists?

A Yes.

Q And then you said earlier that Mr. Evans came in about an hour later, is that what you said?

A Hour and a half or hour.

Q All right. And was someone with him when he came in?

A Yes.

Q Who was with him?

A One more person, I just can't recall who it is.

Q You can't recall what?

A I can't recall who it was.

Q But it was one more person with him

Q When he came in, did he come in with anything else, other than this one person?

A Yes.

Q What did he come in with?

A Rifle and some ammunition.

Q Rifle and some ammunition?

A Yes.

Q And what did Mr. Evans do with this rifle and ammunition that he brought with him?

A He took it to the bathroom, he took it into the bathroom and told everybody to come in there.

Q He called everybody together?

A Yes.

Q Did everybody get around him then?

A Yes.

Q Proceed and tell us now, as best you recall, what Mr. Evans said and did when everybody was around him?

A He was showing us how to load and unload the rifles, and what to do if they was to jam. That was about it.

And he said --

MR. FLEMING:

I can't hear you.

THE COURT:

"What to do if they jammed," and then he said, he started to say, "He said" something.

A He was showing how to load and unload the rifles, and he was talking to Otis.

Q Otis?

A Yes.

Q What did he say to him?

A He said he had 600 more dollars.

Q He what?

A He had 600 more dollars.

Q He had 600 more dollars?

A Yes.

Q Tell us whether or not there was any conversation said where this money came from?

A No.

Q What did Ahmed Evans say when he said he had 600 more dollars?

A What did he say?

Q Yes.

A He just said he had 600 more dollars from the suckers.

Q From the suckers?

A Yes.

Q Did Ahmed Evans -- tell us whether or not, did Ahmed Evans, when he was describing the manipulation, the nomenclature of that gun, and the operation, were the other weapons near him, too?

MR. FLEMING:

Objection.

THE COURT:

I assume it is on

the basis of being leading?

MR. FLEMING:

Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT:

The objection is

sustained.

Q While he was describing the operational particulars of this gun, where were the other weapons that you said were in the room?

A On the floor.

Q Right near him?

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Where were they in relation to Ahmed Evans?

A In the living room.

Q In the living room. Where was Ahmed Evans when he was describing the mechanism of this gun?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Where was Ahmed Evans when -- I will withdraw it.

MR. FLEMING: Thank you.

Q All right. After Mr. Evans said he had 600 more dollars from the suckers, what next took place in the presence of Mr. Ahmed Evans after he discussed he had money?

A Well, he left.

Q Who did he leave with?

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection. We don't know he left with anybody.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A Otis.

Q Otis?

A Yes.

Q And was there any conversation by Mr. Evans as to where he was going, as to where he was going before he left?

A To Atlantic Mills.

Q I can't hear you.

A To Atlantic Mills.

Q To do what, sir?

A To get some more rifles.

Q To get some more rifles?

A Yes.

Q And did the Brother Panthers and the Nationalists still stay at the house then?

A Yes.

Q And anybody else come in the house, either during the time Mr. Evans was describing the workings of this gun or after he left?

A Yes.

Q Who came?

A El Rasheer.

Q El Rasheer?

A Yes.

Q He came in alone?

A Yes.

Q Did he bring anything?

MR. TOLLIVER:

Objection.

A No.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q Did you say no, sir?

A No.

Q What did all of you do after Mr. Evans left, if anything?

A Sat around and listened to music.

Q Sat around and listened to music.

How long was Mr. Evans gone at this time?

A I don't have the slightest. I left.

Q You left?

A Yes.

Q How long did you stay after Mr. Evans left to buy more guns?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. FLEMING: Your Honor, I

request that the jury be instructed to disregard that last statement.

Q Didn't you say Mr. Ahmed --

THE COURT: The jury will disregard the question.

Q Didn't you say earlier that he had left with \$600 to buy more guns at Atlantic Mills?

A Yes.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q Now after he left with the \$600 to buy more guns, you said what you did, how long were you there?

A About 15, 20 minutes.

Q And then you left after that?

A Yes.

Q About what time of day did you leave, sir?

A About 12.

Q About 12 o'clock?

A Probably it was earlier than that.

Q I see. And did you come back to the house?

A Yes.

Q About what time did you come back to the house?

A About two days later.

Q About two days later.

Now, bringing you back to the point where Mr. Evans had left to buy some more guns, was there any conversation with Mr. Evans, with anybody, as to what he was going to do with those additional guns?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: I assume you are asking about conversation in his presence that he heard.

MR. LAURIE:

I said that exactly.

Q Did Mr. Evans have any conversation with what he was going to do with the guns?

MR. FLEMING:

Objection.

THE COURT:

The objection is

overruled.

Q Go ahead, Mr. Washington.

A Yes.

Q What was that?

A That we was to have a shoot out with the police.

Q You were supposed to have a shoot out with the police?

A Yes.

Q When you left, Mr. Washington, did someone leave with you?

A No.

Q You left by yourself?

A Yes.

Q All right. And did a Mr. Thomas Lanier join your group and go there, too?

MR. FLEMING:

Objection.

THE COURT:

Overruled.

Q Thomas Lanier, was he with you?

A When I left?

Q When you went there?

A Yes.

Q Is he part of your group?

A Yes.

Q And was he there during this entire period that you testified to?

A Yes.

Q When you left, tell us whether or not did he stay or go with you?

A He stayed.

Q All right. Why did you leave at 12 o'clock?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled. You are not concerned about the fact that he said he left a little before 12, are you?

Q On or about 12 o'clock, why did you leave there, Mr. Washington?

A I went over on St. Clair.

Q What did you go there for?

A To see my aunt.

Q I see. And tell me whether or not had you expected to go back again?

A Yes.

Q And what caused you not to go back again?

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection to that.

THE COURT: I don't know whether he did go back or not.

MR. LAURIE: He said he was going back, but he didn't. I asked why didn't you go back.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A I --

Q Wait. I can't hear.

A They said the police --

MR. FLEMING: Objection to what they said, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is this a conversation that took place while you were still at the place on Auburndale you are telling about?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE WITNESS: He asked why didn't I go back.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Put another question.

The objection is sustained.

Q What caused you not to go back?

A I didn't go back because I heard on TV that the block was surrounded.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: Just a minute,

please. The objection is sustained. The jury will disregard that last statement.

Q What time of day or night was it that you decided that you were not going to go back?

A What time?

Q About what time was it when you came to a decision that you were not going to go back, do you recall?

A I don't know. I think it was in the afternoon. After -- about 3, 4 o'clock.

Q You did say, however, that you had gone back there a couple of days later?

A Yes.

Q And --

A One day later.

Q I'm sorry. One day. One day after the 23rd you are referring to?

A Yes.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: I thought it was one day after the 22nd. Didn't he say he was there on the 22nd the first time?

Q You were there on the 22nd?

A The first time I was there was on the 23rd.

Q The morning of the 23rd?

A Yes.

MR. LAURIE: I believe it was his testimony.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection. His testimony was the 22nd.

THE COURT: My recollection was he said the 22nd.

THE WITNESS: I said the first time I heard of Ahmed Evans was on the 22nd. The first day I seen Ahmed Evans was on the 23rd.

Q The meeting was called on the 22nd for the 23rd?

A No.

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

A The meeting was called on the 23rd.

Q Yes. And you heard about the meeting that morning?

A Yes.

Q I see. All right. And then do I take it you went back on the 24th of July?

A Yes.

Q And what time of day or night was this that you had gone back on the 24th?

A It was in the morning.

Q In the morning. And did you go there alone or with others?

A One other person.

Q One other person. Do you recall who he was, Mr. Washington?

A Ahmed.

Q Who?

A Ahmed, not this Ahmed.

Q Another Ahmed?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall any other name he had with Ahmed so we can show the distinction?

A No,

Q But it was not this Ahmed that you refer to, that you saw in his house?

A No.

Q This Fred Ahmed Evans that you saw in the house, that did these things and said these things you testified to, is he in the courtroom this morning?

A Yes.

Q Where is he?

A Over there (indicating).

Q Indicate by clothing, what type of clothing is he wearing?

A Black, green and red dashiki.

MR. LAURIE: May the record show he is identifying the defendant as the man he saw and talked to at the house at 12312 Auburndale, your Honor?

THE COURT: It may so show.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection to his saying what the address was.

THE COURT: The Auburndale house.

We understand he is talking about it.

Q (By Mr. Laurie) Now, sir, when you went with this other Ahmed to this house, was it the same house behind the tavern --

A Yes.

Q -- where you had seen the defendant there the day before?

A Yes.

Q And who did you see there, if anybody?

A Who did I see?

Q Somebody there?

A No.

Q And can you describe the conditions outside of this house, before you went into this house on that day?

A Windows was broke out.

Q Windows are broken.

You will have to keep your voice up.

A Windows were broken. Tubes was laying all over the ground.

Q Tubes?

A Yes, can-like tubes.

Q Anything else?

A No.

Q Were there people in the street?

A No.

Q And --

A Yes. National Guard.

Q National Guard in the streets?

A Yes.

Q And were there any police officers in the street, too?

A Down on Superior.

Q How did you get past the National Guard?

A Distracted them.

Q Pardon me?

A Distracted their attention.

Q Distracted their attention?

Then both of you made your way into the house, is that it, sir?

A Yes.

Q Was anybody in the house behind the tavern when you got in there?

A You mean on the side of the tavern?

Q Inside.

A No.

Q Can you describe the inside of this house now as you saw it on the 24th, to the best of your recollection?

A Clothes was on the floor.

Q Speak up, Washington.

A Clothes was on the floor. The place was tore up. That's about it.

Q Did you see any other unusual items around there?

A Tinfoil.

Q What?

A Tinfoil.

Q Tinfoil?

A

A Yes.

Q What did you do when you got in the house?

A I looked around for a rifle.

Q You looked around for a rifle.

Did you find one?

A Yes.

Q Where was it?

A In the closet, in the room. In the room that was offside of the living room.

Q Was this in the back suite, Mr. Washington?

A Yes.

Q And did you go to the front suite, also, of this apartment?

A No.

Q And tell us whether or not, did you see any other weapons or ammunition there?

A No.

Q And this rifle was by itself in the closet, you say?

A Yes.

Q And what did you do with it?

A I took it on 124th -- yes, 124th, and the police took it from us.

Q Before you took it out of the house, how did you carry it out?

A In a rug.

Q How did you make your way, how did you -- after you got out of the house, what direction did you go?

A Toward the National Guard.

Q Toward the National Guard?

A Yes.

Q Where were they? On Auburndale?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you go across Auburndale?

A I went across Lakeview.

Q Across Lakeview?

A Yes.

Q How did you get by the National Guard this time?

A I talked to them.

Q You talked to them?

A Yes.

Q Then you got across Lakeview. Then where did you go?

A 124th.

Q 124th and what?

A Superior.

Q 124th and Superior,

You made your way with Ahmed to this area?

A Yes.

Q When you got to 124th and Superior, what happened there, if anything?

A Policemen followed us over there and they took the

rifle. They talked -- they stayed over about an hour trying to get the rifle. They sit down for about an hour, because we wouldn't give them the rifle. Then they found the rifle and they took it with them.

Q They found the rifle?

A Yes.

Q Where was it?

A Under the couch.

Q You had gone in the house?

A Yes.

Q What house was this, sir?

A About, it's about middleways up the block.

Q Do you know who lived in this house?

A No.

Q You just went in an empty house, or was it?

A No.

Q Or was somebody living there?

A One of Ahmed's friends.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

Q Ahmed, that was with you?

A Yes.

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection to that.

Q Now, did you say the police found it under the couch?

A Yes.

Q They took that rifle?

A Yes.

Q Then what did you do, sir?

A I left.

Q I see. And tell me, did you take any part in this revolution that you said was going to take off?

MR. TOLLIVER: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q Did you take part in the revolution?

A Yes.

Q What did you do?

A Oh, I went over Ali Khan's -- I was with Ali Khan.

Q You were with Ali Khan?

A Yes.

Q Where was this, sir? Where did you go with Ali Khan?

A Back over to where the policemen was on the corner, 125th and Lakeview.

Q 125th and Lakeview?

A 124th.

Q What did you do there?

A Ali Khan got out and he told me to go back up on 105, and so I went back up on 105 and I went home.

Q Did Ali Khan have a weapon with him?

A No.

Q When you said you took part in the revolution, what

do you mean?

A No.

Q Other than what you testified to?

A Yes.

Q I see. Did you see Ahmed Evans any more from the time you testified that he had left the house with the money to buy guns?

After that time, did you see him any more after that?

A No.

Q And this house that you say was behind the tavern on Auburndale and Lakeview, that is in the City of Cleveland, isn't it?

A Yes.

Q Cuyahoga County?

A Yes, sir.

Q State of Ohio?

A Yes.

Q I believe you told me where you lived, Mr. Washington, but where are you staying now?

A On St. Clair -- oh, at the Detention Home.

MR. FLEMING:

I can't hear.

THE COURT:

He said "at the

Detention Home."

Q You are there pertinent to some charge?

A Yes.

Q Is that situation disposed of?

A I don't know.

Q I see. And did you have a hearing already?

A Yes.

Q Did you enter a plea of some kind?

A Yes.

Q What plea did you enter?

A Guilty.

Q How long ago was this that you entered a plea of guilty?

A About a month and a half.

Q A month and a half ago?

A Month and a half ago.

Q When you entered this plea of guilty a month and a half ago, did you ever see me at that time?

A Did I ever see you?

Q Before that time.

A Yes.

Q Pardon?

A Yes.

Q Before you made a plea?

A Oh, no.

Q But you saw me after you made a plea?

A Yes.

Q And I had some conversation with you and with some officers at the Detention Home, didn't I?

A Yes.

Q And at those conversations, did I at any time threaten you or promise you anything?

MR. FLEMING: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q Are you testifying of your own free will at this hearing, sir?

A Yes.

MR. LAURIE: You may examine.

CROSS-EXAMINATIONBY MR. TOLLIVER:

Q Mr. Washington, where were you born, in Cleveland?

A Yes.

Q Give us your exact day of birth.

A 1951, March 26.

Q March 26, 1951?

A Yes.

Q You were born in Cleveland?

A Yes.

Q And what is your father's name?

A Walter Washington -- Walter Lee Washington.

Q And is he still living?

A I don't know.

Q When did you last see him?

A When I was about two or three.

Q What is your mother's name?

A Edna Washington.

Q Is she still living?

A Yes.

Q Where does she live?

A 9909 St. Clair.

Q And what was your address in July of 1968?

A 9909 St. Clair.

Q You were living with your mother?

A Yes.

Q Do you have any brothers or sisters?

A Yes.

Q How many?

A Two sisters, one brother.

Q Are your sisters older than you or younger?

A No.

Q Both younger?

A Yes.

Q One older, one younger?

A Younger.

Q Both younger?

A Yes.

Q How about your brother?

A Younger.

Q You were the first child, the oldest child?

A Yes.

Q In June of '68, were you in school?

A In June of '68?

Q Yes.

A No.

Q Had you been to school at all in 1968?

A Yes.

Q Did you graduate?

A No.

Q What grade did you get to in school?

A The 11th.

Q What school?

A Glenville.

Q And did you drop out of school?

A No.

Q Were you put out of school?

MR. LAURIE: Objection.

A No.

THE COURT: Overruled.

Q Then what caused you not to graduate?

A The police was looking for me.

Q The police were looking for you?

A Yes, sir.

Q And the police were looking for you for what?

A Not going to court.

Q Not going to court?

A Yes, I was auto trespassing.

Q When did this auto trespass occur?

A '68.

Q You were supposed to go to court and you didn't?

A No.

Q Therefore, you stopped going to school?

A Yes.

Q Did you leave home?

A Yes.

Q When did you leave home?

A '68.

Q Well, when in '68 did you leave home?

A I don't know.

Q Well, was it in June?

A Around that time.

Q May?

A Around that time, some time in the summer, spring.

Q But you can't tell us exactly when it was you left home?

A No.

Q And you say you left home because the police were looking for you?

A Yes.

Q In connection with an auto trespassing?

A Yes.

Q And after you left home, where did you stay?

A We winded up at 11113 Superior.

Q What was 11113 Superior?

A Apartment.

Q Who owned the apartment?

A I don't know.

Q Did you live in a suite?